NEWMAN AND RITUALISM.

REV. WILLIAM NICHOLAS, M.A., D.D.

Visitors to Dublin and Christians interested in the circulation of GOSPEL TRUTH are respectfully invited to visit the

Dublin Tract Repository,

BIBLE AND BOOK SALOON,

DEPÔT FOR CHRISTIAN LITERATURE.

A LARGE ASSORTMENT OF BOOKS,

Suitable for Sunday School Premiums, &c.

All Magazines supplied on day of Publication.

SPECIAL TERMS TO SUNDAY SCHOOLS.

10, D'OLIER ST., DUBLIN.

CHEAP STATIONERY WAREHOUSE,

2, NASSAU STREET, DUBLIN.

CREAM LAID ENVELOPES,

One Penny per Packet.

SPECIALITY.—1½ lbs. Packet of

VERITABLE VELLUM

Note Paper,

9½d.

STEWART'S

BOOKS.

Sunday School Premiums, Bibles, Prayer Books, Wesleyan Hymn Books, Church Hymnals, Temperance Literature, Tonic Sol Fa Publications, &c., &c.

Agent for the Methodist Sunday School Union.

CHEAP MUSIC WAREHOUSE,

2, NASSAU STREET, DUBLIN.

PRESCOTT'S is the best house in the Kingdom for Cleaning and Pressing Gentlemen's Clothes in three days. Prescott's, 17, Cornmarket, Dublin. Country orders attended to. Dry cleaning.

PRESCOTT'S Steam Dye Works, 17, Cornmarket, Dublin; Ladies' Summer Dresses Dry Cleaned same as new without being unpicked in three days at Prescott's; country orders attended to.

PRESCOTT'S Steam Dye Works, 17, Cornmarket, Dublin; Gentlemen's Light Suits can be dyed a splendid Blue, Brown or Black in four days, 6s. per suit, at Prescott's.

PRESCOTT'S Steam Dye Works, 17, Cornmarket, Dublin; Shawls, Dolmans, Jackets, Ulsters, Cloaks, and every description of dyeing and cleaning done in first-class manner at Prescott's.

PRESCOTT'S Steam Dye Works, 17, Cornmarket, Dublin; Gentlemen's Suits cleaned like new in three days: Coats, 2s. 6d., Trousers, 1s. 3d., Vests, 9d.; at Prescott's, 17, Cornmarket, Dublin.

PRESCOTT'S Steam Dye Works, 17, Cornmarket, Dublin; Lace Curtains cleaned, 1s. per pair; Blankets cleaned and stoved, 2s. 6d.; Quilts cleaned, 1s. 6d. each; all country orders receive our prompt and careful attention.

NEWMAN AND RITUALISM.

Star Life Assurance Society

LONDON AND DUBLIN.

HEAD OFFICE FOR IRELAND:

12, Stephen's Green North, Dublin.

Funds in Hand, nearly	£3,000,000
Claims Paid exceed	3,000,000
Bonus Divided exceeds	1,465,000
Annual Income exceeds	440,000

Policies Issued, over 60,000.

SPECIAL : FEATURES.

Moderate Premiums.
Free or Paid-up Policies.
Immediate Payment of Claims.
Large and Compound Bonuses, etc., etc.
Policies Doubled in Amount by Successive Bonuses, and in some instances the Future Premiums Cancelled and Cash Bonuses Paid thereon.

Full particulars on application to the Agents, or to

GEORGE CHAMBERS, Secretary for Ireland,
12, Stephen's Green North, Dublin.

N.B.—Young Men are specially recommended to assure under the Endowment or Savings Bank System, payable to themselve on attaining a given age.

NEWMAN

AND

RITUALISM.

BY THE

REV. WILLIAM NICHOLAS,

M.A., D.D.

Being the substance of Sermons Preached and now Published by Request.

London:
C. H. KELLY, 2, CASTLE STREET, CITY ROAD, E.C.
WM. MCGEE, 18, Nassau Street, Dublin,
TRACT REPOSITORY, 10, D'Olier Street, Dublin,
S. E. GANT, 39, Royal Avenue, Belfast.

PRICE SIXPENCE.

CARDINAL NEWMAN.

Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind.—*Rom.* xiv. 5.

A VERY important principle underlies these words—a principle that is pre-eminently a Protestant one. It is, that in matters of faith and morals every man should exercise his right of private judgment.

In one of his posthumous essays John Stuart Mill traces the intellectual superiority of the Protestant nations to the fact that Protestants think for themselves on religious questions and that this gives them such valuable mental training and exercise that they can think on other matters with greater clearness and force than those can who are accustomed to yield submissively to the voice of authority. One branch of the argument from Authority has been used regarding Cardinal Newman with considerable effect.

It has been said that Cardinal Newman was a man of great learning and ability, of great piety and devotion, a sincere man who knew both sides of the controversy between the Church of Rome and Protestantism, therefore it is reasonable to follow him. We cannot tell how many have reasoned thus, but many have acknowledged that this train of thought has led them to Rome.

Persons have supposed that there must be some strong reason in favour of the Church of Rome when such a good man as Newman joined it, and they have said with a sort of despairing wonder, 'How do you account for it?' As if it could only be accounted for by some powerful argument with which they were unacquainted, but which was known to Newman and influenced his mind.

Thus many persons are more or less unsettled, and think that there is probably more in the Romish argument than we Protestants are willing to admit. This state of mind I have met with even amongst ourselves, and hence I shall try to show you, and I hope successfully, that there is nothing in Newman that should lead us to take him for a guide, and that the arguments and influences which moved his mind can be determined and valued, and are not of such a nature as in the least to imperil the Protestant position or to strengthen that of the Romish church.

Before attempting an analysis of his intellectual and moral faculties let me give you

I. A BRIEF BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH.

John Henry Newman was born in London on February 21st, 1801.

His father was a banker, a man of considerable

culture and an Evangelical member of the Church of England. His mother was a Huguenot, a godly woman and moderate Calvinist, who came of a family who had sacrificed position and estates by their devotion to Protestantism. The only companion of his childhood that we read of was Benjamin D'Israeli.

We would like to know something of the life of those boys who afterwards played such important parts on the world's stage.

But of Newman's boyhood and home life we know little—in which respect his autobiography is a perfect contrast to that of John Stuart Mill, whose home life is vividly portrayed. Amongst the books that Newman read in his early life and that influenced him we find, in addition to the Bible, Scott's works, from which he learned the 'unworldliness' which distinguished him throughout his whole career, and 'Growth the Evidence of Life,' which may be regarded as the germ of his 'Essay on Development': from Law's 'Serious Call' he learned the doctrine of Eternal Punishment, which he never subsequently doubted. He took great delight in reading Milner's extracts from the Fathers, and from them imbibed high notions of ecclesiastical influence and prerogative; on the other hand he got from Newton on the Prophecies

the idea that the Church of Rome is Antichrist. This conception, he says, 'stained' his imagination for many years. He also read Tom Paine's tracts. Much of Newman's subsequent mental history may be regarded as the conflict of ideas received from these books. He was converted at the age of fifteen.

It is not, however, a rare thing to find men getting entirely away from the ideas that have surrounded their home life and early years. A most sturdy Protestant minister, an eager Controversialist, called one of his sons Martin Luther, and Martin Luther is at this day a priest in the Church of Rome. One of the ablest opponents of Agnosticism has a daughter who is a pronounced Freethinker. So there is nothing marvellous in finding the little boy brought up in a pious Protestant home forsaking the religion of his parents and dying a Prince of the Church of Rome.

At an early age he went to Oxford, and took his degree in the third class. As a scholar he never achieved any distinction at the University. Of science he knew little, of modern Biblical criticism nothing.

With many of the Fathers he was well acquainted; he was a master of Church History, so far as the period covered by the Arian Controversy

is concerned. Of other periods he had not any distinguishing knowledge. He never professed to be, and never was regarded as a profound systematic divine, either Protestant or Roman Catholic.

When he went to Oxford he came in contact with various currents of thought and it would be an interesting study to dwell upon the way in which he was attracted and repelled. At that time he was very impressionable. From one he learns that the Bible is not to teach theology but to prove it; that we must go to Tradition, to the Creeds, the Fathers, and the Church, in order to learn; from another he learns Apostolical Succession, from another Baptismal Regeneration, and so on. He was greatly influenced by Hurrell Froude, a man of great genius and enthusiasm, filled with hatred of Protestant principles and admiration for the Romish Communion; and also by Keble—who was, as far as any *one* was, the 'fons et origo' of modern High Churchism. When 'The Christian Year' was published in 1827 he at once enthusiastically adopted the sacramental system set forth in it. From Whateley he learned the Anti-Erastian views which characterise the 'Tracts.'

In 1829 Newman was appointed vicar of St. Mary's, where the University sermons were preached;

he had also a small parish at Littlemore, to which he went sometimes for retirement.

At length 'out of his own head' he started the publication of the 'Tracts for the Times.' Pusey, who had left his Liberalism and his Protestantism behind him in Germany, joined what was called the 'Movement,' and gave it a weight and importance it had never possessed before.

The growth of Newman's religious opinions, at this period, may be more clearly traced in his 'Essay on Development' than in any of his other works. We may speak of it as his last Anglican or his first Romish work with equal correctness. The war of opinions so long raging in his mind had ceased. He no longer speaks of 'Roman Catholics' but boldly calls them 'Catholics'; and before he had finished the book had resolved to be received into the Church of Rome. In 1841 the celebrated Tract XC. was published. It raised such a storm as no tract published during this century has paralleled. It was denounced by the 'Heads' as 'evading rather than explaining the Articles;' it was denounced by bishop after bishop as dishonest and un-Protestant. Newman retired to Littlemore, and after much thought came to the conclusion that the only course open to him was to join the Church of Rome. Accordingly he did so,

and was admitted into the Communion of that Church by the Passionist Father Dominick on the Feast of St. Michael and All Angels, 1845.

He was ordained a priest and said his first mass in the Chapel of the Propaganda on the Corpus Christi Festival, 1847. It is worthy of note that Manning served at it. Newman did not feel called to become a monk, so he continued as one of the secular clergy, and founded an Oratory at London and another at Birmingham.

The original founder of Oratories was St. Philip Neri. He was Newman's special favourite amongst all the saints, for him he had a tender love and devotion. It may interest you to learn something of him who occupied such a large part of Newman's thoughts, and affections, and prayers.

St. Philip Neri was an Italian. His parents were both of wealthy Tuscan families. He was born at Florence in the year 1515. From his earliest youth he was what would now be called 'religiously inclined.'

He was remarkable as a child for the implicit obedience which he yielded to his parents, and even then had a great desire for suffering, which was his idea of being an 'imitator of Christ.' At the age of eighteen he went to Rome, and became tutor to the sons of Caccia, a Florentine gentleman.

Here Philip's life was one of great austerity. His food consisted of one meal a day, which meal was generally of a small loaf and some water. His sleeping-place was the floor.

His prayers at this time were long and frequent, and he practised many mortifications and penances. He, with others, used to spend forty hours in adoration before receiving the Holy Communion at special seasons of the year.

At the age of thirty-six he was ordained priest, and for some time lived in a community with a number of other priests at the Church of St. Jerome of Charity. Soon after this he founded at Rome the first of the orders of secular priests known as 'Oratories.'

St. Philip Neri was chiefly remarkable for his intense humility, or rather for his admiration of that virtue. In order to cultivate humility he always took special pains to make himself an object of ridicule, so that he should be esteemed mean and worthless.

Once he shaved off half his beard, and seemed to have enjoyed the ridicule thus brought upon him ; indeed, he seldom allowed a day to pass without devising some means of making himself a laughing-stock.

He kept a very large dog, which he would

sometimes carry in his arms through the streets, and would compel his penitents to carry it, or lead it by a chain or string through the streets of Rome. Sometimes he would set them to wash and comb it. This dog was one of his chief means of mortification both to himself and his penitents for fourteen years, during which time it became known as the 'cruel scourge of human minds.'

He had a cat which seems to have been another source of annoyance. For six years daily he sent some of his people to fetch meat from the butcher for this cat, and often in the presence of his most distinguished visitors, be they noblemen, cardinals, or prelates, he would make most affectionate enquiries about his cat.

Such a man was St. Philip Neri, the patron saint and model of John Henry Newman. A man who doubtless lived a life free from vice, but who seems to have been a man with a weak mind, and with that morbid desire for suffering which characterised many 'saints' of the Roman Church. A man who carried the beautiful grace of humility to such an absurd extreme—that it became with him something approaching to a vice. At any rate his character lacked what Tennyson calls 'self-reverence.'

In 1852 Newman was appointed rector of the

newly formed Irish Catholic University, and resided in Harcourt Street in this city of Dublin till 1857. During his residence here he wrote what is regarded by many as the best of all his works, 'On the Idea of a University.'

He does not seem to have been a success as a rector. He had no administrative ability. He had no tact in governing men. He was addicted to favouritism. At any rate, with the hearty concurrence of the Irish bishops, he was recalled by the Pope. He then went to the Oratory at Birmingham where he continued to the end.

In *MacMillan's Magazine* for January, 1864, Kingsley attacked him and the priests of Rome for utilising 'pious frauds,' and for a general absence of manly straightforwardness in their public communications. This led him to write in self-defence the 'Apologia pro Vita Sua;' a charming piece of autobiography from which, in the following pages, we shall take many extracts.

When Pope Pio Nono was bent on having a Conciliar declaration concerning the Papal Infallibility, Newman argued that, whilst the dogma was true, it was not wise at that time to have it pronounced. He was one of the leaders of those who were called 'Inopportunists.' After the meeting of the Vatican Council, Newman declared that he

always—at least since he joined the Church of Rome—had held the dogma. Even this opposition was more than Pius liked. He made Newman a Doctor of Divinity; but he would never have raised him to such a position as he afterwards occupied. Indeed Newman did not stand high with the then Pope. When an English priest was introduced to Pius IX., and he was told that he had been received by Father Newman, the Pope said, 'Padre Newman, bah!' and passed on. It is related of Manning that he would not rise from his knees even when the Pope told him to do so. His reverence had its reward, for he was early made a cardinal. Do not suppose that that was the sole ground of his elevation; but with such a man as Pius, believing so firmly in his own infallibility, and impatient—to say the least—with any one who did not enthusiastically accept it, Manning's policy doubtless had its effect.

When Pius was gathered to his fathers and Leo XIII. was Pope, one of his first resolves was the elevation of Newman to the cardinalate. This was opposed by Manning, who spread the rumour that he would not accept the proposed dignity. By communications through Bishop Ullathorne the Pope was made aware that Newman was willing to accept the honour, and on the 12th

of May, 1879, he received the cardinal's hat and was henceforth known as John Henry, Cardinal Deacon of St. George in Velabro.

So great was his gratitude to Leo for this distinction that he undertook a journey to Rome in order to thank him in person for the high honour conferred upon him. When he arrived, before taking food or rest, he went to the tomb of St. Peter that he might thus do honour to the great apostle. On his return he purposed paying a visit to Miss Giberne, who had been called the 'prima donna' of the Tractarian movement, but was prevented by illness.

Although Newman was an old man of nearly eighty years when he became cardinal, he applied himself eagerly to learn all the ceremonies involved in his position, and although some of them were cumbersome enough, he scrupulously performed them. It had been his habit to go into the church of the Oratory by a back way, but when in the full robes of a Cardinal he took the trouble to go round by the front entrance. Like St. Paul, but perhaps in another sense, he 'magnified his office.'

As cardinal he paid a visit to the Oratory he had founded in London. With some of the fathers there—notably with Faber—he had not had any communication for twenty-five years in conse-

quence of not having been on intimate terms with them. Now that he was in such a position as to be entitled to receive them on their knees, he paid them a visit and there was an apparent reconciliation. He often preached at the Oratory, but his sermons were very brief and poor. He took neither time nor pains in their preparation. He did not think an ordinary congregation worth an effort. His sympathies were with universities and university men and not with the 'common people.'

He continued to have a fluent pen, and his letter to the Duke of Norfolk was the best answer to Mr. Gladstone's 'Vaticanism.' He took a great interest in the school for the sons of Roman Catholic gentlemen at Acton, and in reading and devotion and composition he lived a blameless and retired life, till on the 11th of August, 1890, after an illness of not many hours, he died at Birmingham, full of days and honours. I cannot add of riches. He never was, and never sought to be, a rich man. Any money he got by his writings and other ways, he spent in what he believed to be for the common good; in fact, if some wealthy people had not recently joined the Oratory it would have been in a seriously embarrassed condition. Great lamentation was made for him throughout the Romish and Anglican Churches, and sympathetic and

generous Protestants used language concerning him of which their cooler judgment would scarcely approve.

The ceremonials connected with his interment were of a most imposing kind, and his remains, followed by many sad hearts, were laid in the little churchyard belonging to the Oratory a few miles out of the city.

In this quiet country graveyard we have a touching evidence that this great controversy concerning Romanism and Anglicanism is one with which we Methodists should concern ourselves. In the same God's acre in which are the remains of the great cardinal are also the remains of a father of the Oratory—for only Oratorians are buried there—who was the son of one Methodist minister, the brother of another, and he himself was once a Methodist local preacher. Is it reasonable then to expect us without a protest loud and earnest to permit our sons and daughters to be led through Ritualism to Rome?

II. It is now my purpose to give you AN ANALYSIS OF NEWMAN'S FACULTIES—INTELLECTUAL AND MORAL—and then to discuss the problem, 'Why did he leave the Church of England and join the Church of Rome?'

1. One of the most prominent faculties in the

intellectual outfit of Newman was an imagination so powerful as to control his judgment.

That the imagination is of great value as an instrument for the discovery and for the elucidation of truth is admitted. But then it must be an imagination kept well in hand by the reason. 'We are accustomed from our youth up,' says Bishop Butler, 'to indulge this forward and delusive faculty ever obtruding itself beyond its sphere; of some assistance indeed to apprehension but the author of all error.' From his youth up Newman was under the influence of that 'forward faculty.' Indeed, it would almost seem as if his judgment and imagination were seldom properly co-ordinated. Just as sometimes in the body one limb seems to have an independent action of its own, and to form a sort of *imperium in imperio;* so at times Newman's imagination seemed to act altogether without his judgment, and then again the judgment would act apparently by itself, and for a time one would have to do with a man of vigorous reasoning powers. As we shall soon see Newman's imagination had much to do with his religious opinions. In many of his poems, but especially in the 'Dream of Gerontius,' the most weird of all his writings, as well as in large portions of his sermons and prose works, he shows that he possessed no ordinary

imagination. The following extracts from the 'Apologia' prove how completely—at times—he was led by this 'delusive'—in his case we are occasionally tempted to say fantastic—faculty.

'I used to wish the Arabian tales were true: my imagination ran on unknown influences, on magical powers and talismans . . . I thought life might be a dream, or I an angel, and all this world a deception, my fellow-angels by a playful device concealing themselves from me, and deceiving me with the semblance of a material world.

'I was very superstitious, and for some time previous to my conversion (when I was fifteen) used constantly to cross myself on going into the dark.'

His views concerning the angels are so highly imaginative that it seems almost incredible that any man of intelligence and culture could possibly hold them.

He says, 'I viewed them, not only as the ministers employed by the Creator in the Jewish and Christian dispensations, as we find on the face of Scripture, but as carrying on, as Scripture also implies, the economy of the visible world. I considered them as the real causes of motion, light and life, and of those elementary principles of the physical universe, which, when offered in their developments to our senses, suggest to us the

notion of cause and effect, and of what are called the laws of nature . . . Every breath of air, and ray of light, every beautiful prospect is, as it were, the skirts of their garments, the waving of the robes of those whose faces see God.' . . . What would be the thoughts of a man who, when examining a flower, or a herb, or a pebble, or a ray of light, which he treats as something so beneath him in the scale of existence, suddenly discovered that he was in the presence of some powerful being who was hidden behind the visible things he was inspecting, —who, though concealing his wise hand, was giving them their beauty, grace and perfection, as being God's instrument for the purpose,—nay, whose robe and ornaments those objects were, which he was so eager to analyse?'

Indeed, so frequently was his judgment swayed by his imperious imagination that we may accept the Bishop of Derry's criticism as being substantially correct: 'Newman's logic was a splendid excuse for taking for granted things he wanted to assume.'

2. Newman's faculty of apprehension was, for so eminent a man, partial and limited. To use an illustration that he himself uses in his 'Grammar of Assent'—a book able and subtle, but which practically teaches us that a man must be either an Agnostic or a Papist—the human eye can only

see part of the midnight sky at any one time, and when it is turned to another part, the former part is absent from the field of vision. So with the mind when contemplating a great subject. Now some eyes have a much larger field of vision than others. So there are mental eyes that can see a much larger portion of a great subject at a time and do not so completely lose sight of the other parts as is commonly the case. Compared with many great thinkers, Newman saw only a small part of a far-reaching question at a time and completely ignored the other parts—even those which he may have seen and noticed at other times. Consequently we often find him leaving out of his consideration of a question facts and arguments having a most important bearing upon it—serving to modify, even if not to give an entirely different complexion to it—and with which facts and arguments his writings show him to have been acquainted. This accounts for the fact that are flat contradictions in his writings, and this also shows us why it was so often necessary for him to explain himself. So glaring are his contradictions that Professor Huxley writes, 'If I were called upon to compile a Primer of Infidelity, I think I could save myself trouble by making a selection from some of Cardinal Newman's works.'

3. Along with this partial and vivid mental vision Newman had a fervid temperament.

He had a warm heart which exercised a sort of magnetic power and drew to him many friends. The words addressed to the Church of Laodicea could never have been addressed to him : 'I would thou wert cold or hot.' He could not be neutral. He could not look at a movement and neither bless it at all nor curse it at all. He must take a side. He must vehemently bless or curse.

4. Then he also possessed a strong will and high courage.

He had a martial spirit. Speaking of the Duke of Wellington's despatches, he said, 'they almost make one long to be a soldier.' He was no timid time-server, no craven coward. He had the courage of his convictions. When the neighbouring Protestants were shocked he never faltered in defending the boys of Acton for playing cricket on the Lord's Day.

Now any man who combines these three qualities, a narrow view, a fervid temperament, and an imperious will, invariably will be a *man who will hold extreme opinions.* He will never hold things in their proportion. This is the very essence of reason, as the etymology of the word rational from ration—proportion—teaches us. His mind's eye

will have a microscopic power. He will exaggerate. He will be an extremist. Such was Newman.

These were his views about his bishop whilst he was an Anglican :—

'I did not care much for the bench of bishops, except as they might be the voice of my Church ; nor should I have cared much for a provincial council ; nor for a diocesan synod presided over by my bishop ; all these matters seemed to me to be *iure ecclesiastico*, but what to me was *jure divino* was the voice of my bishop in his own person. My own bishop was *my pope ; I knew no other ; the successor of the Apostles ; the vicar of Christ.*'

Yet Newman knew how widely the bishops differed, so that he put himself in the position of making many of his views and actions depend not upon what was true or false, right or wrong, but upon what diocese he happened to be in.

Again he says :

'The Catholic Church holds it better for the sun and moon to drop from heaven, for the earth to fail, and for all the many millions on it to die of starvation in extremest agony, as far as temporal affliction goes, than that one soul, I will not say should be lost, but should commit one single venial sin, should tell one wilful untruth, or should steal one poor farthing *without excuse.*'

Now, without dwelling upon the questionable morality of the last clause 'without excuse,' which implies that there may be excusable theft, we would ask, Do his words fairly represent the teaching of the Catholic Church? We think not Are they words of truth and soberness, the expressions that a well-balanced mind would use? Again we must answer, No.

It was feared by many in the Church of Rome that Newman would have been a "Minimizer." The same idea, accompanied rather by hope than by fear, prevailed outside it. Again and again I have heard it asserted—when some of the more superstitious doctrines or more idolatrous practices of the Church of Rome were being discussed—'You may depend upon it a man like Newman does not believe that, or does not practise the other.' Such was the popular view, but it was not the correct one. Newman was extreme in his Romanism. In proof of it listen to his language concerning Protestants:

'I do profess that Protestantism is the dreariest of possible religions; that the thought of the Anglican service makes me shiver, and the thought of the Thirty-nine Articles makes me shudder. Return to the Church of England! No! "The net is broken, and we are delivered." I should be a

consummate fool (to use a mild term) if in my old age I left "the land flowing with milk and honey" for the city of confusion and the house of bondage.'

Witness the fact that for his guardian angel he had a tender devotion. He called him his friend and his brother:

'Mine oldest friend, mine from the hour
When first I drew my breath;
My faithful friend that shall be mine,
Unfailing till my death.

Mine when I stand before the Judge:
And mine if spared to stay
Within the golden furnace till
My sin is burned away.

And mine, O brother of my soul,
When my release shall come;
Thy gentle arms shall lift me then,
Thy wings shall waft me home.'

His sermon on 'The Assumption of the Blessed Virgin' is well worth reading as a remarkable specimen of the unreasonable lengths to which an intelligent man will go in maintaining a favourite idea in opposition to every law of logic and dictate of common sense.

One who lived in the Oratory with Newman,

referring to a collection of popular Italian devotions translated into English by Father Ambrose St. John, Newman's life-long and most intimate friend, tells us: 'These devotions have the speciality of being all "indulgenced," and beyond that they are mostly expressed in singularly strong terms towards our Lady and the saints, terms that are undoubtedly idolatrous, if, under such circumstances, any terms are. There is no obligation for any one to make use of them in private or in public. Apparently they originated in private use, and for that they are perhaps best adapted. But they are utterly un English in tone, and many excellent English Catholics feel themselves quite unable to use them. There was a priest at the Oratory, the son of a Catholic Lancashire farmer, who could never see his way to join in these devotions. And it would certainly have astonished many of the admirers of Dr. Newman who believed that his Catholicism was of a "moderate" kind, if they could have seen him (as they might evening after evening in the month of May) forming one of a semi-circle of priests, vested in cottas and bearing lighted tapers, kneeling before the gaudily painted statue of the Virgin, which stands on the left at the upper end of the nave of the church, and leading or joining in these extravagant and tasteless devotions.'

In further support of this view I give you an extract from the funeral sermon preached by 'Father' Ryder at the Oratory.

'Great was his devotion to the Blessed Sacrament of the Altar. He never omitted saying daily mass except when incapacitated by bodily infirmity, and in his latter days he felt the impossibility of being able to say mass as the greatest of his trials, and often spoke of it as such. His fervour and devotion when saying mass was most edifying to those who assisted. He had also a tender devotion to the Mother of God, which shows itself in many of his writings; and he was specially fond of saying the rosary. He spoke of it as a most beautiful devotion, and often said that when deprived of the power of saying mass he found his greatest compensation in saying the rosary and meditating on its beautiful mysteries. When in health he attended all the devotional exercises of the Oratory. His mode of life was simple, and in conformity with his profession of a son of St. Philip. Of his devotion to St. Philip, whom he tenderly loved as a son loves his father, I need not speak. He has left abundant evidence of this in his writings. When in Rome he loved to visit the Holy Places, and it is recorded that when first he went to Rome after his conversion, though he arrived late in the day and much

fatigued by his journey, he would neither rest nor take food till he had been to visit the tomb of the Prince of the Apostles, there to renew his profession of faith.'

And as the concluding evidence that Newman was not a 'Minimizer,' but on the other hand was extreme and enthusiastic in his Romanism I give you a beautiful and touching extract from his sermon on 'God's Will the End of Life.'

'Oh, my Lord and Saviour! support me in that hour in the strong arms of Thy Sacraments, and by the fresh fragrance of Thy consolations. Let the absolving words be said over me, and the holy oil sign and seal me, and Thine own body be my food and Thy blood my sprinkling. Let Thy sweet Mother Mary breathe on me, and Thy angels whisper peace to me, and Thy glorious saints, and my own dear Father Philip smile upon me; that in them all, and through them all, I may receive the gift of perseverance, and die, as I desire to live, in Thy faith, in Thy Church, in Thy service, and in Thy love.'

5. As well as the other qualities we have mentioned there was a considerable spice of arrogance in Newman's disposition.

Perhaps you are ready to quote expressions of great humility in his writings against this view, but

you must remember that many of the most arrogant men have made profession of the deepest humility. I do not mean to imply that they were insincere. At times they probably felt that they ought to be humble and fancied themselves to be so, but when the occasion called it forth the arrogance was then in full force. So I have often found it to be the case.

Newman sang of himself, 'Pride ruled my will.' An intimate friend testifies of him, that he was what Dr. Johnson called 'a good hater.' At the Oratory nothing short of absolute submission would please him. If a brother offended him he would not speak to him for months at a time; and even when there was absolute submission to him he was slow to restore the once disobedient one to his favour. Now, if to the qualities already mentioned you add this spice of arrogance, you then have a man who will be *intolerant.* So was Newman.

Whilst an Anglican he persuaded a lady not to attend her own sister's wedding, because that sister had turned Dissenter. His brother, Francis Newman, wore 'the white flower of a blameless life,' free from sordid self-seeking; a studious, conscientious man; yet, because of religious differences, Newman would have no communication whatever with him. The spirit of religious intolerance never appears

more odious than when it thus severs the ties of nature.

As another evidence of his intolerance, I give the following:

Contrasting heretics and heresiarchs, he said, 'The latter should meet with no mercy: he assumes the office of the tempter, and, so far forth as his error goes, must be dealt with by competent authority, as if he were embodied evil. To spare him is a false and dangerous pity. It is to endanger the souls of thousands, and it is uncharitable towards himself.'

The Apostle Paul says, 'Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind,' but John Henry Newman has quite a different idea of how men who do not agree with him ought to be dealt with.

6. Newman's mind was so exceedingly complex, that at times he left himself open to the charge of duplicity. The most distinguished critic who has yet written about Newman contrasts him with Döllinger, and says that 'Döllinger's mind was simple, Newman's was complex.' There are men who act from impulse, or whim, or self-interest, without any consideration as to whether their conduct is right or wrong; no one would think of putting Newman in the category with them. Then there are men who, with absolute simplicity, follow

the guidance of an enlightened conscience: I would not be disposed to classify Newman with them. Again there are men who, before they act, must persuade themselves that they are going to do what is right: to this class I think Newman belonged. That he would deliberately do what he thought to be wrong I do not believe, but that he often deceived himself as to what was right, by his extreme subtlety, I have no doubt. He followed his conscience, it is true, but he followed it as a man in a gig follows the horse he drives, in the road he wishes it to take.

Newman's admirers claim for him great simplicity and great intelligence. They cannot substantiate his claim to both. Shortly before he went to Rome he said there was an 'impassable chasm between himself and Rome.' Now many saw whither he was, not drifting, but rushing. If he did not see it, where was his great intelligence? if he did see it, where was his great simplicity? If he was perfectly honest he was not very intelligent; if he was so very intelligent he was not perfectly honest. Notwithstanding his courage and his honour, there was a 'complexity' in his nature that often led to an apparent want of straightforwardness. This is evident in his habit of evasion—the old charge of the 'Heads'—so that it was commonly said by the

fathers of the Oratory, 'We do know what he means, but we know that he does not mean what he says.'

When the Vatican Council made new declarations of doctrine, Ignatius von Döllinger said, 'When I am told that I must swear to the truth of these doctrines, my feeling is just as if I were asked to swear that two and two make five and not four.' Here we have true simplicity, manly straightforwardness. Döllinger, although implored to yield, and implored by the highest authorities, refused to do so, and suffered excommunication rather than violate his conscience and surrender his intellect. His conduct was noble. Newman does not compare favourably with him. I do not wonder that when they met Newman and Döllinger did not get on very well together, or that Newman said of their intercourse, 'It was like a dog and a fish trying to become friends.'

I could give you many evidences of the 'complexity' of Newman's mind; let two suffice, one from the Apologia and the other from Tract XC.

'I do not think we have yet made fair trial how much the English Church will bear. I know it is a hazardous experiment,—like proving cannon. Yet we must not take it for granted that the metal will burst in the operation. It has borne at various

times, not to say at this time, a great infusion of Catholic truth without damage. As to the result, *viz.*, whether this process will not approximate the whole English Church, as a body, to Rome, that is nothing to us. For what we know, it may be the providential means of uniting the whole Church in one, without fresh schismatising or use of private judgment.'

In the conclusion of Tract XC. we read :—

'What lately has taken place in the political world will afford an illustration in point. A French minister, desirous of war, nevertheless, as a matter of policy, draws up his state papers in such moderate language, that his successor, who is for peace, can act up to them without compromising his own principles.

'The world, observing this, has considered it a circumstance for congratulation; as if the former minister, who acted a double part, had been caught in his own snare. It is neither decorous, nor necessary, nor altogether fair, to urge the parallel rigidly; but it will explain what it is here meant to convey. The Protestant Confession was drawn up with the purpose of including Catholics; and Catholics now will not be excluded. What was an economy in the reformers is a protection to us.

'What would have been a perplexity to us then,

is a perplexity to Protestants now. We could not have found fault with their words: they cannot now repudiate our meaning.'

Let us sum up our analysis of Newman. He was a man highly imaginative, with a rather narrow yet vivid mental vision, of a fervid temperament, strong will, and considerable courage; to a large extent he was conscientious and devotional, free from all vulgar vices, yet his mind was so complex and subtle that, to say the very least we possibly can say, he did not always *seem* to be perfectly honest.

III. We are now in a position to consider the question, WHY DID NEWMAN LEAVE THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND, AND JOIN THE CHURCH OF ROME?

Dr. Pusey and others imply that it was the harsh treatment he received from the Anglican authorities after the publication of Tract XC. that drove him to Rome. I do not think that is a satisfactory answer to the question.

Ideas are like seeds. There is always a reason why the seed of any particular flower will develop in one soil and not in another. It depends, *inter alia*, upon the composition of the soil and its consequent suitability to the particular seed. So, when we consider that one idea will develop until it domi-

nates one mind, and that the same idea will not find a lodging at all in another mind, and will only be imperfectly developed in a third, we are forced to the conclusion that there are minds which are peculiarly susceptible of, and adapted to certain ideas.

Newman's mind was dominated by the idea of a visible Church teaching and ruling among the races of men. His imagination was captured by the order, and pomp, and antiquity, and assumed infallibility of the Church of Rome.

> 'Oh, that thy creed were sound!
> For thou dost soothe the heart, thou Church of Rome,
> By thy unwearied watch and varied round
> Of service, in thy Saviour's holy home.
> I cannot walk the city's sultry streets,
> But the wide porch invites to still retreats
> Where passion's thirst is calmed, and care's unthankful gloom.'

were his words many years before he joined her.

For a long time his position was that the Church of Rome had the note of Catholicity, but that the Anglican Church had the note of Apostolicity, Rome having lost this by her corruptions, which Newman again and again denounced. But then it dawned on him that in the controversies of the past the popes had been right. The phrase of Jerome with reference to Pope Leo, 'Securus

judicat orbis terrarum,' had a marvellous influence on his mind. In the Apologia he compares it to 'Turn again, Whittington, Lord Mayor of London,' and to the 'Tolle lege' of St Augustine. He was, however, puzzled to see why the Church of Rome should have bishops in England where there were Anglican bishops; for he still clung to the idea that the Anglican was *the* Church in England.

Then, when the Anglicans established a bishopric at Jerusalem, he reasoned that if the Anglican Church could have a bishopric there, the Roman Church might have one in England. This was an end of that difficulty. He felt fully the absurdity of maintaining that the Anglican Church is the one true Church of Christ in England, and the Church of Rome the one true Church in Italy. So that a man belonging to the Church of Rome in Italy is right, but if he comes to England and does not change his Church, he is wrong. Then this matter is further complicated by the fact that if he comes from Italy to England and joins the Anglican Church, he is excommunicated by the Church which is the true Church in Italy. To reconcile these absurdities to anything agreeable to ordinary common sense passes the wit of man. Hence Newman says that 'An Anglican is like a man standing on one leg.' So, as he would not give up his idea of a

visible Church, he did what was perfectly logical, and the only thing that would have been logical under the circumstances, and joined the Church of Rome. Rome has never made the mistake of admitting that there can be a *second* Catholic and Apostolic Church. My explanation, then, of how it was that Newman left the Church of England and went to the Church of Rome is simply this:—that having lost his hold of the truth that the Bible is the ultimate standard of faith and morals, and that God will give His Spirit to guide into the truth those that ask Him for that guidance; having accepted the authority of traditions and of the Fathers, and the existence of *one* visible Church on earth, as the supreme and infallible authority in all questions of faith and morals: and being a highly imaginative, fervid, strong-willed and somewhat imperious man, without popular sympathies and with highly-developed æsthetic sentiments, Newman was exactly the sort of man to be attracted to and enslaved by the services, the history and the claims of the Church of Rome. In fact, entrance into that Church was the only logical conclusion of the premises he had accepted.

If our analysis has been at all correct, it is very evident that Newman was not a man whose example should have any weight with us who

desire to be led by reason, and by the Word and Spirit of God, rather than by the imagination, and tradition, and the Fathers, and a worldly and ambitious Church.

We may learn many lessons from this subject. Let us keep to the sure word of prophecy. Let us maintain our right of private judgment. Let us implicitly follow the voice of conscience and the Spirit of God, and let us remember that the Church of Christ consists of all who are united to Him by a living faith, no matter with what particular organisation they may be connected—or by what particular name they may be called—and that no man or body of men has a right to lord it over our faith and conduct, but that every man must give an account of himself to God.

If we learn these lessons, the time will not have been lost which we have spent in studying the life and religious opinions of Cardinal Newman.

RITUALISM.

God is a Spirit : and they that worship Him must worship Him in spirit and in truth.—*St. John* iv. 24.

IN our Lord's conversation with the woman of Samaria, He lays down a universal principle with regard to the *Object* of worship : 'God is a Spirit : and they that worship Him must worship Him in spirit and in truth.' Here we have given us the Object of our worship :—God Himself, not a representation of Him, not an image ;—not a something in which He inheres, not a consecrated wafer ;—not a place where He may be supposed to abide, not a shrine ;—but God Himself. They that worship must worship *Him.*

In this passage there is also laid down for us the *nature* of true worship. 'They that worship Him must worship Him *in spirit and in truth.*'

We are to worship *in spirit.* True worship requires more than ceremonies, words, or attitudes. Our hearts must be engaged, or our worship will be in vain. Spiritual, not merely formal, worship is acceptable to God.

We are to worship *in truth* :—that is, in a true way : in a way that is in accordance with the will of God as revealed in His Holy Word. Not in a way of man's devising, not in a way of will worship,

not in a way of mistaken reverence, or of superstition ; not in any false way. 'They that worship Him must worship Him . . , *in truth.*'

We object to Ritualism because it contravenes these principles. In what is known as Ritualism we detect *an excess of ceremony in Divine Worship; and the use of forms which symbolize unscriptural doctrines ; and of practices which are antagonistic to the teaching of the New Testament.*

That Ritualism exists, no one will attempt to deny. Is it then fair to ask ;—Is Ritualism an evil? We shall endeavour to prove that it is.

We farther ask, does it prevail to such an extent as to make it a matter of pressing importance that it should be exposed? and ought we to use every possible effort to prevent its farther spread? We think so: and we shall submit a number of facts for your consideration, which we trust will lead you to think so too.

SPREAD OF RITUALISM.

We shall try to show that it does prevail to an alarming extent, that it is increasing, and that every Protestant ought, in fidelity to God, to oppose it, as being at once 'false doctrine, heresy and schism.'

We shall consider some indication of its vast extent and growing influence. Modern Ritualism is not yet fifty years old. The Rev. Jas. Cargin says :—

> 'It broke forth in Oxford about 1843. Pusey was its theologian, Newman its genius, Keble its poet. The account of its progress from that date till the present would prove an instructive study. . . Keble and Pusey never left the Church of England. Newman 'verted to Rome in 1845. Manning (now a Roman Catholic Cardinal) in 1851, two of the Wilberforces soon afterwards, and altogether in the course of about twenty years 217 Episcopal clergymen went over to Rome. Besides these, were 16 peers of the realm, 20 peeresses and ladies of title, and nearly 470 men of position and influence in the Church, and since that time the exodus, in one sense, continues with rapidly increasing volume. It is calculated that there are at present over 300 priests in the Church of Rome who were formerly in the Church of England ; and of the 20,000 clergy of that same Church of England, men conversant with the fact say the half, or over 10,000, are High Church or

Ritualists, while the Evangelical and Broad Church make up about 5,000 each. Of course those 10,000 are not fully developed Ritualists, but the accounts in *Church Times*, *Rock*, etc., go to show that over 4,000 of them are enrolled in the English Church Union and other Ritualistic guilds and organizations, and the rest, believing in priestism and sacramental grace, seem following quickly in their steps. So the leaven spreads.' The following extract from a letter will show you the lengths to which the Ritualists go in England. 'On Sunday I went to church to St. Alban's, Holborn, London, famous for its High Church practices. What I saw there both surprised and shocked me. On entering the church and looking up at the chancel, I could scarcely believe I had not by mistake gone to a Roman Catholic place of worship. There was the high altar, with its crucifix, candles, and flowers. In front of the crucifix was an erection which I have since learned is called a tabernacle—and contains the consecrated wafer. This wafer is always left on the table for adoration. Printed notices in different parts of the church informed the members of the congregation the days on which confessions would be heard. Morning

prayers had commenced when I reached the church. Only one clergyman was officiating, who I thought monotoned the prayers rather too quickly. The singing was not very good. It could not be called an elaborate musical service. In due time we came to the prayer of St. Chrysostom and the end of the service. Then followed the grand ceremonial of the day, which I would like to describe to you if I could, but a great deal of which I was unable to understand.

'When the candles on the altar were lighted, three priests—gorgeously attired in rich red silk—entered the church and placed themselves in front of the altar, with their backs to the congregation. They were accompanied by three others who wore bright scarlet cassocks and very short white surplices. These seemed to have charge of the incense—swinging the censers seemed to be their only duty. There were also four little boys dressed in bright scarlet, and who carried lighted candles. These little boys remained kneeling in front of the altar during the whole service.

'They proceeded with what I believe was a celebration of the Holy Communion—but what looked to me to be a series of adorations

and genuflexions. Occasionally I could hear something which they said—but for the most part they spoke so indistinctly that I could not possibly follow the service, not even the prayers with which I am most familiar. They made several deviations from the service in the Prayer-book, and I noticed that the people in the congregation did not seem to use the Book of Common Prayer, but substituted a Service Book which I hope is confined to St. Alban's. Before the sermon which was preached that day, amongst the announcements made from the pulpit, the congregation were requested to pray for the repose of the soul of some persons who had recently "departed this life." I also noticed that though the congregation was a fairly large one, only one person received the Holy Communion. I cannot say I liked the service—or any part of it—I am beginning to think that after all there is some sense in having a Protestant Defence Association. It makes me very sad to see such a "Rome-ward movement in the Church which the Reformers hoped would be God's candle in England."'

RITUALISM IN IRELAND.

Ritualism has since then crossed the Channel; and though it has not grown so rapidly as in England, yet there are many signs of its presence and vitality in Ireland.

The literature which is distributed amongst the people is a very fair criterion of the opinions of those who circulate it. If men distribute *Open Court* publications, we naturally infer that they sympathize with what is called 'free thought.'

If they distribute *Stirling Tracts* we conclude that they are Evangelical. So if we find clergymen distributing *The Banner of Faith*, recently prohibited in one diocese in Ireland, and magazines and tracts filled with teaching that can scarcely, if at all, be distinguished from the teaching of the Church of Rome, we are justified in regarding such persons as Ritualists. The daily papers teem with evidence that there are Ritualists in our midst. In the account of the last Easter Vestry in Armagh, it was publicly stated that there were clergymen of the Protestant Church of Ireland who believed in every doctrine of the Church of Rome except its latest dogma :—'The Personal Infallibility of the Pope.'

Evangelical Episcopalians bear their testimony

with sorrow to the spread of Ritualistic doctrines and practices. At the last meeting of the general synod it was stated by men of position and influence that there was a crying need for Ecclesiastical Discipline. The Rev. Dr. Wright, who has taken so decided a stand on this question, asserted at a largely-attended clerical meeting, several clergymen defended and advocated the practice of Auricular Confession.

The Irish Ecclesiastical Gazette, a weekly Church paper, recommended by the Bishop of Derry as 'moderate in tone,' and avowedly having the sympathy of a large number of the clergy, and especially of the younger clergy of the Church of Ireland, makes no secret of its love for Ritualism. It states that, 'It is the reflex action of revived English Church life that has told in this country and is telling. The restoration of our churches, the improved ritual, the increasingly comely services, the full congregations, the growing reverence in public worship, the improvement of Church music . . . all this is due to the impact on our shores of that very English Ritualism which some affect to deplore.'

A great statesman has said, 'If you want to find out what is the public opinion on any subject, you must go to the letter bag.' Let me give you a

few extracts from some letters that I have received :—

A lay friend has written to me : 'Why do you oppose the great Catholic Revival? You ought to live and let live. The Ritualists leave you alone. Why don't you leave them alone?' This shows that Ritualism is not without its sympathisers.

I have also had a communication from a highly respected minister of our own Church, in which he says : 'I am glad you are taking up the subject : the spread of Ritualism has been so rapid, that we should make every effort in our power to oppose it.'

A minister of another Church, and one who is intimately acquainted with the state of the country, writes as follows :—

'I understand that an influential appeal has been made to you to take up the subject of Ritualism : and to deliver a number of sermons or addresses upon it from your pulpit. I sincerely hope you will see your way to do so. I can understand the reluctance which a minister of one Church may naturally feel about taking up for public discussion a question which may appear more properly to concern another. But I am strongly of opinion that this feeling should not be allowed to influence you or others with similar responsi-

bilities resting upon them in this particular case. This has grown to be more than a mere denominational question. It concerns our common Protestantism. It is no breach of charity to say that the Evangelical party in the Church of England have proved themselves to be lamentably weak in their defence of Protestant interests in that Church. And now, when those interests are being assailed nearer home, those brave men in the Irish Church who are manning the breach deserve the active support of their brethren of other Churches. I believe that in the true spirit of the Gospel, it will be appreciated and valued. . . I wish that all ministers were alive to the danger which threatens interests which should be dearer to us than life, and were doing all in their power to arrest its approach.'

From these facts and statements we are warranted in drawing the conclusions :—

1. That Ritualism is in Ireland.
2. That Ritualism is spreading in Ireland.

WHAT HAVE METHODISTS TO DO WITH IT?

But, probably, some will say, 'Admitting that these things are so, yet, "what have Methodists to do with it?" Why don't they mind their own

business, and leave their neighbour's business alone? Ritualism concerns the Episcopal Church, and let that Church grapple with it in its own time and manner, by its own officers, courts, and laws.' But we assert that a matter which concerns our common Christianity is the business of the Methodist, and of all other Christian Churches.

It is our business:—

Because we should take a broad and enlightened, and not a narrow view, of our duty towards our fellow-men. It becomes us, because every man should not 'look on his own things' alone; but every man should look also on 'the things of others.' No one has a right to say, 'I'll mind myself alone, I do not care about others; let them look after themselves.'

If, when the effort was made for the suppression of the slave trade, this narrow, selfish feeling had prevailed, that abominable traffic would have continued unabated.

When Temperance Societies were first started, suppose good men had said, 'If people like to get drunk, let them: it is their own affair, and no business of mine.' What would have become of the great Temperance movement, which has rescued so many thousands from the drunkard's sorrow, guilt and doom?

Or, when Missionary Societies were being founded, in order to send the Gospel to those who were in heathen darkness, if this objectionable spirit had prevailed, we should not have had to-day the crown and glory of our Churches in the Great Foreign Missionary Organization.

This spirit that leads a man to think of himself alone is poor, mean, and ignoble. It is the spirit of Cain, who said: — 'Am I my brother's keeper?'

As men who have a duty to their own generation, and are trying to serve the present age, we ought to concern ourselves about those matters which affect the spiritual interests of our common humanity. Even a heathen could say, '*Homo sum, et humani a me nil alienum puto.*'

It is our duty to oppose Ritualism *for the sake of the Episcopal Church*, in which many devoted servants of God are doing all in their power for the defence of Protestant principles, and we should give them all the help and prayer and sympathy that we can.

And we should also, *for the sake of our own young people*, do all that in us lies to ensure that a pure faith be taught in the Protestant churches throughout our land. For if Ritualism, Rationalism, or Scepticism be in the air, they surely run a great

risk of being infected when they leave their homes and go out into the world.

A gentleman once built a house in which he paid very great attention to all sanitary arrangements: and it seemed as if it was made impregnable against the attack of infection. But in the village close by a fever broke out owing to some defective and neglected drainage, and from the village the fever entered his house, and his only daughter fell a victim to it and died.

So it is with the spread of Ritualism. Even if our own pulpits be free from it, if it is being taught in other Churches, now that there is so much social and other intercourse between the members of the various Churches, what is to prevent our young people from becoming infected with it? And as they may so readily come in contact with the poison, we should be beforehand with the antidote.

We should also do so *for the glory of God.* As a branch of the Church of Christ, we ought to be witnesses for the truth. We should bear our testimony against doctrines that obscure the glory of the one great Sacrifice of Christ, that bring many mediators instead of One between God and men: and that exalt an order of men into a position injurious to themselves, degrading to their fellows, and without warrant from Holy Writ.

SOPHISTICAL DEFENCE OF RITUALISM.

Some are almost blinded by the sophistical defence made by the Ritualists. They say something like this when asked the reason for some of their practices, 'It is a mere matter of taste; we like a little more ceremonial than what is laid down in the Rubrics. You like a little less; and if we break the Rubrics on the side of having too much ceremonial, our Evangelical brethren break them by having too little, and we ought to leave each other alone.'

But we contend that it is *not a mere question of taste.* For instance, the first step was to do away with the black gown in the pulpit, and substitute the white surplice. It was then said, 'This is a trifle, the white looks more bright and becoming than the sombre black.' But it was not a mere trifle, the principle which underlies it is this;—While the surplice is worn, the clergyman is speaking the voice of the Church, and clad with the authority of the Church, whilst the black gown is merely the scholastic gown which is worn by the preacher as one qualified to teach, and implies that he is giving an opinion which is to be listened to with deference, but which is not binding on the conscience of the hearers, unless their judgment

is convinced that he speaks as the oracles of God. 'I speak as to wise men; judge ye what I say,' declared the great Apostle of the Gentiles, and in a similar spirit should all Gospel ministers address their hearers.

Ritualism is sometimes sneered at as being a question of 'man-millinery;' but it is not. That a love of display has something to do with it I believe, but that does not lie at the heart of the question. In order to understand this question of vestments, we must consider the teaching of the Church of Rome. From the Catechism of the Council of Trent we learn that the priest, when saying mass, represents Christ:—'This, the words of consecration declare: the priest does not say this is the body of Christ, but this is my body; and thus invested with the character of Christ, he changes the substance of the bread and wine into the substance of his real body and blood.' The officiating priest is clothed with certain vestments which are designed to be emblematical of the different circumstances connected with the last sufferings of our Redeemer. The *amice*, a linen veil which the priest puts on, represents the covering put on our Lord's face in the high priest's house; the *alb*, a long white robe—the robe of a candidate king—represents the robe put on

Christ in derision of His claims by Herod's soldiers ; the *girdle*, which ties the alb round the body of the priest, represents the cord with which our Saviour was bound when seized by the Jews ; the *maniple*, put in the left arm, represents the cord that bound Christ to the pillar when he was scourged ; the *stole* represents the cord whereby he was led to be crucified ; the *chasuble* represents the seamless coat of Jesus, and the scarlet robe in which the soldiers scornfully arrayed him. Now the Ritualists have the same vestments, and approximate as closely as they dare to the Romish ceremonial ; are we not then warranted in the belief that their doctrines are not very different from those of Rome? Thus Ritualism is not a question of taste or of man-millinery either.

CHARGES AND COUNTER-CHARGES.

The reply of the High Church party to some of the accusations brought against them is to retaliate by making what are known as 'counter-charges' against the Evangelical party, and to demand that if the Rubrics are to be enforced so strictly upon one section of the Church, another section ought not to be allowed to break them with impunity in a different direction. The *Irish Ecclesiastical Gazette*, a few weeks ago, said, 'The

Rubrics ought not to be made of elastic for one party, and of cast-iron for another.'

We must enquire into this. Are the Evangelicals and the Ritualists equally guilty, only in different directions?

The counter-charges against the Evangelicals are:—

1. The mutilation of the Communion Office by the omission of all parts thereof prior to the offertory.
2. The breach of the mandatory Rubric after the Nicene Creed—first, by omitting to make the announcements therein prescribed; and, secondly, by making announcements contrary to what is there laid down.
3. The non-observance of Holy Days.
4. Breach of the Rubric at the close of the Communion Office directing that the consecrated elements remaining after the administration of the Lord's Supper shall be consumed.

As regards the last charge, it was proved that one clergyman consumed the remaining elements in the vestry, and not in the church, under the impression that the vestry was included in the church.

Without entering at length on the consideration of these counter-charges, we assert that they are of comparatively little importance, that they are of no theological significance; and that there is not one of them which manifests, in the slightest degree, any departure from Protestant principles, or any want of loyalty to a Protestant Church. Therefore we conclude that the two parties are not equal in guilt.

Imagine in some naval conflict one officer on board a man-of-war leaves off some article of clothing, in order that he may have greater ease and freedom in the fight; and that another officer, a traitor to queen and country, hauls down the 'Union Jack,' and tries to hoist the 'Tricolor,' and when found out by the loyal officer he defends himself by the *tu quoque* argument, and says, 'You have not kept the law, either, you have taken off your jacket.' Would any one regard the men as equal in guilt? Neither will those who weigh the matter fairly say that trivial negligences in ceremonial observance are to be placed on a par with grave departures from the simplicity of the Gospel; or that the omission of unimportant parts of prescribed forms should be regarded as the moral equivalent of the maintenance and deliberate teaching of doctrines condemned by the authorita-

tive standards of the very Church of which these men are ministers.

REAL AIMS OF THE RITUALISTS.

By many sophistries the real aims of the Ritualists are disguised. Many of them 'hide their hand' and make more or less plausible excuses for their practices. Some are more outspoken than others, and one of the most serious failings of the party is a disingenuousness that savours more of the Jesuitism of Rome than of the simplicity and godly sincerity which ought to distinguish the true followers of Christ.

THE REAL AIMS OF THE RITUALISTS ARE:—

1. To destroy Protestantism: it is a system they hate. 'I am not a Protestant, I am an Anglican' is often said, and said too as if it were something to be proud of. I remember attending some lectures of an eminent High Church dignitary; and when he was discussing Martin Luther and the Reformation, he had no word of sympathy or of kindly appreciation for the labours and difficulties of the Reformers, but his sentiments found expression in the phrase applied to the Reformation, 'The Great Religious Revolution of the sixteenth century."

There was an intensely bitter feeling towards Protestantism in the mind of Hurrell Froude, who greatly influenced Newman, as well as in Newman's own mind. Newman says :

'But as regarded what was called Evangelical Religion or Puritanism there was more to cause alarm. I observed upon its organization ; but on the other hand, it had no intellectual basis, no internal idea, no principle of unity, no theology. Its adherents,' I said, 'are already slowly separating from each other ; they will melt away like a snowdrift. It has no straightforward view on any one point on which it professes to teach ; and to hide its poverty, it has dressed itself out in a maze of words. We have no dread of it at all ; we only fear what it may lead to. It does not stand on intrenched ground, or make any pretence to a position ; it does but occupy the space between contending powers, Catholic Truth and Rationalism. Then indeed will be the stern encounter, when two real and living principles, simple, entire, and consistent, one in the Church, the other out of it, at length rush upon each other, contending not for names and words, or half views, but for elementary notions and distinctive moral characters.'

The same feeling prevails to-day. Contempt, dislike, and intolerant opposition prevail amongst

the Ritualists towards those who profess to be Evangelical.

This may partly be accounted for by some of the evils that occasionally arise in Protestant communities. The excessive multiplication of sects, the violation of taste and propriety in public worship, irreverent and fanatical familiarity with Divine things, incompetent men forcing themselves or being forced by others into the services of the sanctuary, 'every man having his psalm and his doctrine,' the supposition that the right of private judgment means the right of violently asserting private whim or caprice or ignorant prejudice—without the exercise of anything that by extremest courtesy could be called *judgment:* these things may have caused a reaction in orderly and cultivated minds, so that they fly to a system extreme in its assertion of order and authority. If this be so, Protestants may well learn a lesson and feel the importance of being wise and prayerful in the exercise of their inalienable right of private judgment.

2. Then some Ritualists would have a corporate union with the Church of Rome; while others would have merely federation with Rome, at the same time acknowledging the pre-eminence—if not the jurisdiction—of the 'Holy See.'

But you say to me 'How do you know? Are you in the confidence of the leaders of the Ritualistic Movement?' I am not in their confidence, but I shall prove that my statements of their real aims are correct from the writings of those who on this subject can speak with authority.

The *Church Times* of March 24th, 1871, said:—'We are contending, as our adversaries know full well, for the extirpation of Protestant opinions and practices not merely within the Church, but throughout all England. What we want is not to force a Close or McNeill into popish vestments, but to make the Closes and the McNeills as extinct as the dodo.' Could anything be plainer than this? And Dr. Pusey says in his preface to *The Re-union of Christendom*, which was edited by Dr. Lee:—'The marvel is that Roman Catholics, whatever their views may be, do not see the wisdom of aiding us to the utmost. Admitting that we are but a lay body with no pretensions to the name of a Church, we yet, in our belief (however mistaken), are doing for England what they cannot do. We are teaching men to believe that God is to be worshipped under the form of bread: and they are learning the lesson from us, which they have refused to learn from the Roman teachers, who have been among us for the last three hundred

years. We are teaching men to endure willingly the pain of confession, which is an intense trial to the reserved Anglo-Saxon nature, and to believe that a man's "I absolve thee" is the voice of God.' . . .

Father Ignatius, who professes to belong to the English Church, in an address lately given in London, spoke more than once of the 'so-called Reformation,' evidently implying that his ideal Church was the dark, gloomy and superstitious one that existed before God in His providence raised up 'the solitary monk that shook the world.' Read the concluding words of the famous Tract XC.: 'The Protestant Confession was drawn up with the purpose of including Catholics; and Catholics now will not be excluded. What was an economy in the Reformers, is a protection to us. What would have been a perplexity to us then, is a perplexity to Protestants now. We could not then have found fault with their words; they cannot now repudiate our meaning.' Do we need any further proofs that I have correctly described what are the real aims of the Ritualists?

THE METHODS OF THE RITUALISTS.

The methods of the Ritualists are insidious. They introduce gradual innovations in the service,

the true meaning of which is often not perceived by the general congregation. Like an insidious disease, which takes hold of a person who is in perfect health, and is at first perceived by no one, and then, by slow but sure degrees, saps the foundation of life: yet the appearance of health is maintained till the patient is practically past recovery. So Ritualism is propagated by insidious but fatal methods. This is not mere Protestant prejudice. Dr. Pusey has said: 'It is the nature of Englishmen to acquiesce in anything, and the public needs only a little leisure to get used to Ritual, to learn to tolerate, if not to love it.' He has also given directions how to, by degrees, completely change the service. He writes as follows: 'Let the advanced posts remain as they are; let each of those which are a little behind, and only a little, gradually take up the same position, and let this process be carried on (only without haste or wavering) down to the last in the chain. A story is told of a dishonest baker who kept himself and his family in meat at a nominal cost by purchasing the very smallest leg of mutton to be had, and exchanging this for the next in size sent him by his customers, and repeating the process till he had succeeded in obtaining nearly twenty pounds of meat for his original six or seven, without any one

customer being able to detect the fraud in his own case. The cheating baker may point a parable, as the unjust steward has done. Where there is only the ordinary parish routine, but where the preaching is honest and sound, let a gradual change be brought in. A choral service, so far as Psalms and Canticles are concerned, on some week-day evening, will train people to like a more ornate worship, and that which began as an occasional luxury will soon be felt a regular want. Where there is monthly communion, let it be fortnightly; where it is fortnightly, let it be weekly; where it is weekly, let a Thursday office be added. Where all this is already existing, candlesticks, with unlighted candles, may be introduced. Where these are already found, they may be lighted at evensong. Where so much is attained, the step to lighting them for the Eucharist office is not a long one. Where the black gown is in use in the pulpit on Sundays, let it disappear in the week. The surplice will soon be preferred, and will oust its rival. It is easy for each reader to see how some advance, all in the same direction, can be made and that without offence being taken.'

We may now claim to know something—and from the highest authority—about the aims and methods of the Ritualists, and consequently we are

in a position to understand the meaning of their symbolical teaching as developed in their various innovations.

THE SIX POINTS.

The principal innovations are those known as 'the Six Points.' They are these :—

1. Crosses on the Communion Table.
2. The Eastward Position.
3. The elevation of the consecrated Bread and Wine.
4. Bowing towards the Lord's Table.
5. The Ceremony of Ablutions, and
6. Auricular Confession.

What is the meaning of these rites? For without doubt they have a meaning, and each of them symbolizes some doctrine. It has been truly said, 'Ritualistic forms are nothing if not symbolic.' As Dr. Lee writes :—'Every act of worship, great or small, every bending of the knee, each upraised hand, each chant, each vestment, each sign, should remind them of that which is unseen, when Catholic ceremonial has God for its object and instructs and edifies man.'

The Church preaches by it to the young, to the poor, and to the ignorant.

Five out of these Six Points teach symbolically the doctrine of the Sacrifice of the Mass, and of Transubstantiation.

It is not illegal to have a cross as an ornament in a church, but it is illegal to have it on the communion table. 'It is the emblem of our faith, and why should we be ashamed of it anywhere?' some say. A very superficial remark. There is a good reason why it should not be on the communion table.

The cross on the table, the elevation of the elements, the bowings towards the communion table, and the eastward position, all teach that in the Communion there is a sacrifice offered to God, and that in the consecrated elements there is the actual presence of the body and blood, the humanity and Divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ.

In the judgment of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, delivered 11th July, 1876, their lordships inquired, at length, into the character and appearance of the Roman Catholic altar as it existed before the Reformation — the doctrine respecting the Holy Communion, which that altar was designed to subserve, and to which it was intended to conform—the change in these doctrines, which was effected by the Reformation, and the subsequent substitution of the plain movable table

of wood for the fixed altar, with its super-altar, its crucifix, and candlesticks at either end, 'and decided that the existence of a cross attached to the table is *not consistent with the letter or the spirit of the regulations made by law.*'

This judgment plainly shows what is symbolically taught by the Ritualists, viz., the Roman Catholic doctrines as maintained prior to the Reformation; farther, in support of our view, we must quote from the 'Black Rubric:'—'Lest the same kneeling should by any persons, either out of ignorance and infirmity, or out of malice and obstinacy, be misconstrued and depraved: It is hereby declared, That thereby no adoration is intended, or ought to be done, either unto the Sacramental bread or wine there bodily received, or unto any corporal presence of Christ's natural flesh and blood. For the Sacramental bread and wine remain still in their very natural substances, and therefore may not be adored; for that were idolatry, to be abhorred of all faithful Christians; and the natural body and blood of our Saviour, Christ, are in heaven and not here; it being against the truth of Christ's natural body to be at one time in more places than one.'

From this we see how anxious the compilers of the Book of Common Prayer were that the peculiar

teaching of the Church of Rome should be kept out of the Church of England. We must, however, say that it is to be lamented that there are in the formularies several expressions and phrases which, to say the least, are ambiguous, and a few which are even more than that. Thus it is plainly evident that those who try to alter the forms sanctioned by law, are doing so in order to introduce the erroneous doctrines and idolatrous practices, condemned and branded by their own Church standards as they have been authoritatively interpreted, as well as by the Sacred Scriptures.

THE EASTWARD POSITION.

Many are the reasons given for the eastward position, which are, in most cases, mere evasions. We are told that they turn to the east, because, like Daniel, they wish to pray with their faces towards Jerusalem. But if in this country we turn to the east, we don't face Jerusalem, but St. Petersburgh; and what reason we can have for turning to St. Petersburgh, it would be difficult to imagine.

We are told that they turn to the east, because it is from the east the light comes; as it is there the sun rises. We quite agree with their turning to the east, if it be taken to be an acknowledgment

that they need more light. It is, however, likely that in the eastward position we have a trace of the influence of the Persian philosophy upon the Early Church ; that it is a 'remainder' of the old Fire Worship.

Others say that when they face the east they look for our Lord's appearing, when He shall come again in the second advent, which is simply an acceptance of vain traditions without even the shadow of Scriptural authority.

But these are all mere subterfuges. The true reason for the eastward position is that they wish to do reverence to the sacrifice which they believe is being offered on the altar, for the east side is the side where the altar was in the temple, and where the communion table is in every church where the Ritualists have complete control.

Dr. Pusey says :—'Standing before the altar (*i.e.*, the eastward position in the Communion Service) means the primitive doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice.'

Another writer has likened the Eucharistic Sacrifice to a king who is holding his court, surrounded by his courtiers, and as they do obeisance to him, so should true worshippers bow before the King of Glory present in the consecrated elements.

THE CEREMONY OF ABLUTIONS.

After the administration of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, the Ritualist pours water into the chalice that has been used and drinks up such mixed wine and water in the presence of the people. This practice follows as a corollary from the Ritualistic doctrine concerning the change that has taken place in the elements used in the Sacrament. It follows as surely as the elevation of the cup and paten. It is in direct opposition to the 37th canon, and has been condemned by the Archbishop of Dublin.

AURICULAR CONFESSION.

The sixth point. Auricular Confession is admitted, encouraged, and defended by the Ritualists as a means of grace which, if not essential to salvation, is, at any rate, essential to an eminently holy life. It was, however, condemned by the Bishops in the Lambeth Conference in 1878. In their official letter it is said :—

> 'It is their deliberate opinion that no minister of the Church is authorised to require from those who may resort to him to open their grief, a particular or detailed enumeration of

all their sins, or to require private confession previous to receiving the Holy Communion, or to enjoin *or even encourage the practice of habitual confession to a priest,* or to teach that such practice of habitual confession, or the being subject to what has been termed the direction of a priest, is a condition of attaining to the highest spiritual life.'

Judas confessed to the priests, and little good came of his doing so. We are told to worship God, and also to confess to Him. His absolution is the only one worth having. The true penitent, like the publican, confessing to God, shall be justified. The sinner who has had the absolution of the priest still has the 'wrath of God abiding upon him.'

Auricular Confession has led to enormous evils in the Church of Rome, it is one cause of the undue influence exercised over the members of that Church by its priests, it is a plain interference with the claims of our great High Priest; and is derogatory to the independence and self-respect of those who kneel before a fellow-sinner and confess to him the most secret thoughts and intents of their hearts. History shows that often in the hands of sensual and unscrupulous men it has led to the grossest forms of licentiousness.

RITUALISM, A SYSTEM WITH MANY BASES.

We have thus in this our day a great Rome-ward movement—a vast wave of thought rolling in the opposite direction to that which swept over Christendom in the sixteenth century.

Thousands of persons of various classes of society and of various creeds are attracted towards and influenced by it.

Ritualism is many-sided. Some are attracted by one aspect of it and others by a different one. Considered as a great system, it is built upon many foundations.

The Æsthetic Basis.

Within the last few years, with the march of civilization there has developed a liking for artistic surroundings, and for a greater amount of elegance and refinement both in our houses, in our furniture and in our dress.

This artistic development has in many cases had an effect upon the architecture and upon the services of the churches. Barn-like structures are no longer in favour. Persons who have no deep religious convictions and are more influenced by taste than by reason, become enthusiastic Ritualists.

In a Ritualistic Church no great demand is made upon their intellectual powers, and so they are saved from 'the malady of thought;' but their æsthetic sentiments are gratified by the ornaments of the church; the robes of the clergy; the artistic music and the order and propriety of the entire service.

And here it is not out of place for me to say that is not at all necessary for a service to be slovenly in order that it may be spiritual. We should give the very best we have, our best thoughts, our best utterance, our best poetry, and our best music to the service of God; as a writer in the *Rock* said some time ago, 'that a slovenly, disorderly service in an Evangelical church will do more in the way of helping the Ritualistic movement than the direct effort of its own supporters.'

Mr. Spurgeon, who will not be suspected of having Ritualistic tendencies, says: 'It is to be feared that our exercises are not in every case moulded into the best form, or presented in the most commendable fashion. There are meeting-houses in which the supplications are neither so devout nor so earnest as we desire; in other places the earnestness is so allied with ignorance, and the devotion so marred with rant, that no intelligent believer can enter into the service with pleasure.

Praying in the Holy Ghost is not universal among us, neither do all pray with the understanding as well as the heart. There is room for improvement, and in some quarters there is an imperative demand for it. Let me, therefore, very earnestly caution you, beloved brethren, against spoiling your services by your prayers; make it your solemn resolve that all the engagements of the sanctuary shall be of the best kind.'

THE MORAL BASIS.

Then Ritualism has a moral basis. There is in some persons an uncertain, timid, and wavering disposition, a nervous *dread of responsibility*. They always find a great difficulty in making up their minds as to which course to take if there should happen to be conflicting claims, or apparently conflicting claims, upon some matters of duty and a system of religion which will decide all matters of conscience, and so save them the trouble of thinking for themselves, is what they desire. Ritualism, with its claims of Apostolical Succession, and of a sacrificing priesthood standing between God and men, meets this desire.

Others have a *shrinking from immediate communion with God*. The feeling within that we have sinned and so incurred God's displeasure, has

always been the cause of our dreading the thought of meeting Him face to face.

When Adam sinned 'he hid himself from the presence of the Lord.'

It was this consciousness of having sinned that made the children of Israel say unto Moses :—

> 'Speak thou with us and we will hear: but let not God speak with us lest we die.'

And the Prophet Isaiah must have had a feeling somewhat similar, when, at seeing the vision of the Lord 'high and lifted up' in the Temple, he exclaimed,

> 'Woe is me, for I am undone; because I am a man of unclean lips, and I dwell in the midst of a people of unclean lips; for mine eyes have seen the King, the Lord of hosts.'

So it was with the Apostle Peter, when he cried to the great Master :—

> 'Depart from me; for I am a sinful man, O Lord.'

And since then, in these later days, when people have the same fear of meeting with God, they try to approach Him through a priest or intercessor, through a saint or angel, and ignore the teaching of our Blessed Lord, Who said: 'No man cometh to the Father, but through Me.'

Many also embrace the teaching of Ritualists from sheer *mental indolence.* It is no uncommon thing to find a man who is active in body but who is intellectually indolent.

A man of this class said, with respect to the discussion in the late General Synod :—

> 'Why on earth don't those laymen leave such questions alone? Can't the clergy decide them for us?'

Others think that ignorance and true devotion are somewhat akin. One so often hears such maxims as the following: 'The Christian life is not a matter of knowing what to do, but of doing what we know.' But this kind of teaching is nowhere commended in the Word of God. In more places than one we are told to use our own judgment in such matters. 'In malice be ye children, but in understanding be men.' Especially if a new teacher comes to us we have a right to test him, as St. John tells us to 'try the spirits whether they be of God.' He does not hide from us the fact that false teachers should arise. And we should apply this to the teaching of Ritualism as well as to every other teaching. A blind, unreasoning assent is nowhere commended to us. St. Paul tells us that we should 'prove all things,' and 'hold fast that which is good.'

INFLUENCE OF VANITY.

Much of the fascination that Ritualism has for some minds comes from the fact that it is a religion which gratifies their *vanity*.

Fashion has always been a very powerful factor in the formation of our opinions and habits. Fashion rules to a great extent, not only in matters of dress, but in our furniture, in our houses, in our conversation and even in our medicine, there are phrases and remedies that for a time 'are the rage,' and also in our religion. Ritualism is fashionable. However we may account for it, such is the fact. But fashion has always been an unsafe guide in religion. In the time of our Lord the fashionable world was not on the side of right; then the powers of the world were against the Holy One and the Just.

Neither was fashion a safe guide in the time of the Reformers; the mighty and the noble were on the side of error. And it is not a safe guide now. We should not think of taking our morals from the world of fashion. In very many things 'the friendship of this world is enmity with God.' 'The fashion of this world passeth away.' Let, then, our faith be founded on the Word of the living God which abideth for ever.

INFLUENCE OF PRIESTLY AMBITION

Another reason for the popularity of Ritualism at least, amongst the clergy is, 'priestly ambition.

Many men of education and intelligence become Ritualists from this motive. A religion which gives a man the power of making an infant a member of the Church of Christ, and an inheritor of the kingdom of heaven; which endows him with the mysterious gift of changing what before was bread and wine into that which he himself adores, the body and blood, humanity and divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ; of forgiving sins by conferring upon the penitent soul his priestly absolution, must appeal and not in vain to many men of strong self-consciousness and vigorous intellect.

These awful powers raising him so much above ordinary men, clothing him with such mystic sanctity, become the objects of desire; his pride is inflamed, his judgment warped, and, by an almost unconscious mental process, he accepts Ritualism as a divine system, not as the result of severe logical reasoning but of reasoning rendered vicious by a dominant priestly ambition.

APOSTOLICAL SUCCESSION.

It is on account of this reason that so many accept the doctrine of Apostolic succession, which is the very tap-root of Ritualism. It teaches that the twelve apostles, upon whom our Lord laid hands, have since transmitted to all those upon whom they, and their successors after them, have admitted to holy orders by the laying on of hands, the gift of the Holy Ghost, and to them, and to them alone, the ministry has been committed.

As one of their hymns runs :—

> 'His twelve apostles first He made
> His ministers of grace ;
> And they their hands on others laid,
> To fill in turn their place.
> So, age by age, and year by year,
> His grace was handed down.'

It is as if from a Leyden jar charged with electricity, a chain extended, and the current goes from link to link to the end of the chain, so grace goes from link to link in the true Apostolic succession. This dogma, by which they exclude all others from the office of the ministry, is class feeling in its most offensive form. It was from some such motive that the apostles forbade the man who was casting out devils. 'Because,' they said,

'he followeth not us.' In this arrogant exclusiveness, if not alone, yet in this pre-eminently are the Ritualists successors of the apostles. But in this imitation of them they are unfortunate, as our Lord condemned the exclusive spirit when it showed itself amongst the twelve. 'But Jesus said, "Forbid him not: for there is no man which shall do a miracle in My name that can lightly speak evil of Me."'

ANGLICAN ORDERS INVALID.

This exclusiveness is specially absurd on the part of Anglicans because it is certain that the Anglican Church cannot establish its claim to the Apostolic succession. If one link in the chain is missing, all subsequent links joined together form a new chain, not a continuation of the old one. Suppose, for the sake of argument, that all the links were duly connected from St. Peter until the time of Archbishop Parker. Parker is one link in the chain: the Anglican orders can be traced up to him; but he is not properly connected with the links that went before. The *proper ordinal* was not used at his consecration; nor were the *requisite number of bishops* present at it. Therefore he was

not duly consecrated, therefore the Anglican orders that are traced up to him are invalid.

A Roman Catholic priest will be admitted to the Anglican Church without re-ordination, but an Anglican clergyman, entering the Church of Rome, must be re-ordained. Is not the inference clear that those who attach importance to being in the Apostolical succession ought to go to the Church of Rome? If I believed that my salvation depended upon the ministrations of a clergyman whose orders were certainly valid, I should never be satisfied with the more than doubtful orders of the Anglican Church. As this is a matter of the very highest importance, in this controversy, I must give you farther evidence in support of my statement. Archbishop Whately, one of the ablest of the Anglican prelates, says in his 'Kingdom of Christ,' page 175: 'There is not a minister in all Christendom who is able to trace up with *any approach to certainty* his own spiritual pedigree.' These words were not uttered in the excitement of debate, nor as the unguarded rhetoric of a public meeting, but were calmly written in what is perhaps the most thoughtful of his many thoughtful essays.

NEWMAN ON ANGLICAN ORDERS.

But on this question I shall quote what to many will be an even higher authority. Amongst those who have left the Anglican communion, and gone to Rome, not one stands higher in public estimation for genius, sincerity, and learning, than Cardinal Newman. The first step in his Romeward journey was taken that day when he wrote in his diary, 'To-day I accepted the doctrine of the Apostolical succession.' After careful study, his deliberate opinion on Anglican orders may be gathered from the following extract from his *Apologia pro Vita sua* :—

'I said, in a former page, that, on my conversion, I was not conscious of any change in me of thought or feeling, as regards matters of doctrine ; this, however, was not the case as regards some matters of fact, and, unwilling as I am to give offence to religious Anglicans, I am bound to confess that I felt a great change in my view of the Church of England. I cannot tell how soon there came upon me—but very soon—an extreme astonishment that I had ever imagined it to be a portion of the Catholic Church. For the first time I looked at it from without, and (as I should myself say) saw it as it was. Forthwith, I could not get myself to

see in it anything else than what I had so long fearfully suspected from so far back as 1836,—a mere national institution. As if my eyes were suddenly opened, so I saw it—spontaneously, apart from any definite act of reason, or any argument; and so I have seen it ever since.

'I suppose the main cause of this lay in the contrast which was presented to me by the Catholic Church. Then, I recognised at once a reality which was quite a new thing with me. Then I was sensible that I was not making for myself a Church by an effort of thought; I needed not to make an act of faith in her; I had not painfully to force myself into a position, but my mind fell back upon itself in resignation and in peace, and I gazed at her almost passively as a great objective fact.

'I looked at her;—at her rites, her ceremonial, and her precepts; and I said, "This is a religion;" and then, when I looked back upon the poor Anglican Church, for which I had laboured so hard, and upon all that appertained to it, and thought of our various attempts to dress it up doctrinally and æsthetically, it seemed to me to be the veriest of nonentities... And as to its possession of an Episcopal Succession, from the time of the apostles, well, it may have it, and if the Holy See ever so decide, I will believe it, as being the decision of a

higher judgment than my own ; but, for myself, I must have St. Philip's gift, who saw the sacerdotal character on the forehead of a gaily attired youngster, before I can, by my own wit, acquiesce in it, *for antiquarian arguments are altogether unequal to the urgency of visible facts.*'

It is thus evident that the Anglican Church has not the 'Apostolical Succession,' and so Ritualism, which boasts of it, which trusts in it, which brandishes it in the faces of all Evangelical Churchmen and Dissenters, becomes, to use Newman's words, 'the veriest of nonentities.'

APOSTOLICAL SUCCESSION CANNOT BE PROVED.

Many persons have an idea 'that there is something in Apostolical Succession after all.' They think that sacraments administered by clergymen who claim it, have a 'something' in them that sacraments administered by ministers who make no claim to the Succession have not. From a superstitious feeling of this kind, Methodists, even, have sometimes taken their children to Episcopalian clergymen to be baptized, and have also gone to the sacrament of the Lord's Supper. Now, it is

well for us to remember that the 'Apostolical Succession' is absolutely incapable of proof.

It is so on two grounds:—

> The historical evidence breaks down; Eusebius himself being witness. Eusebius wrote about A.D. 320. He had read everything which remained by any or all the Fathers before him; he was the friend of Constantine the Great. He sought to preserve from oblivion the successions of the apostles. Yet in doing this he tells us that he had to 'tread a solitary, untrodden way, and can nowhere find so much as the bare steps of any men who have passed the same path before; excepting only some show and divers tokens here and there have been left us, particularly declaring of the times they lived in, holding forth torches, as it were, afar off, and lifting up their voices on high and calling as out of a watch-tower what way we ought to go, and how without error or danger to order our discourse.'

Even as regards the see of Rome; it is doubtful if St. Peter ever lived there, and authorities are about equally divided as to whether Clement or Linus was his successor. It is not too much to say that no living man can tell.

Farther, according to the teaching of the Church of Rome, a right intention is necessary to the validity of a sacrament. Holy Orders is a sacrament: and if, during those centuries when bishops were amongst the most ignorant and dissolute of men, any of these consecrating bishops consecrated another without the right intention, his orders, and, consequently, all orders that he might confer were invalid. Who can give anything worthy of being called evidence that all those bishops had the right intention when engaged in discharging the duties of their office?

It therefore follows that the claim of any clergyman to be in the Apostolical Succession is absolutely incapable of proof.

APOSTOLICAL SUCCESSION OF NO VALUE.

But those Churches which claim it—without, however, substantiating their claims—have not benefited by the supposed possession. It has not kept them from theological error, it has not kept them from schisms, it has not kept them from gross moral corruption. Their history compares unfavourably with the history of those Churches

which make no such claim. Wherever the doctrine of the Apostolical Succession has been held, sacerdotalism has flourished. It is significant that for more than one hundred years after the Reformation the petition for the clergy read, 'That it may please Thee to illuminate all bishops, presbyters and deacons, with the true knowledge and understanding of Thy Word,' and that during the reaction from Puritanism and the growth of belief in the Apostolical Succession, in 1662, the word 'priest' was substituted for the word presbyter in this petition.

APOSTOLICAL SUCCESSION DISPROVED BY THE CASE OF ST. PAUL.

When the apostles co-opted Matthias in the place of Judas, it might have seemed that, by the laying on of hands, spiritual gifts would be communicated in direct succession from the original twelve. But God called Saul of Tarsus to the apostolic office; and thus at the very beginning taught us that the essential qualification for the office of the ministry in the Church is the call of God Himself. St. Paul was not a whit behind the chiefest of the apostles. He withstood St. Peter to his face, yet he was not *in the Succession.*

So it has been ever since 'the Holy Ghost has

made men overseers' in the Church purchased by the blood of Christ. Not that Church order and Church authority are to be despised. The Church, the body of believers in a particular place, has a voice, and ought to have a voice, in setting men apart to the work of the ministry: but first, and chiefly, there must be the voice in the heart crying with more or less distinctness, 'Woe is me, if I preach not the Gospel.' I believe in an Apostolical Succession, the links of which are apostolical belief, apostolical spirit, and apostolical practice.

Intimately connected with this idea of the Apostolic Succession is an

ERRONEOUS CONCEPTION CONCERNING THE CHURCH.

What constitutes the unity and continuity of the Church of Christ is a wide question, and one upon which it would be foreign to our purpose to enter at this time. The Scriptural view, broadly stated, is that all those who are in living, spiritual relationship with Christ constitute the Church. The Ritualistic view is that, in these lands, at any rate, the Anglican Church is the true Church of Christ, and that connection with her clergy is necessary to salvation as a rule—exceptional cases may by the Great Judge be treated exceptionally on the ground of 'invin-

cible ignorance,' or by the extension of 'uncovenanted mercies.' But ordinarily the method of salvation is for the infant or adult to be regenerated in baptism by the clergy, for the grace so received to be confirmed by the clergy again at the rite of confirmation, and then for the spiritual life to be maintained by the sacrament, consecrated and administered by the clergy. Then, in case of sin, the clergyman is to hear confession and absolve—under certain conditions—and restore the erring one to the privileges of Church membership. Thus the Ritualistic way to heaven is by connection with the clergy, obedience to their commands, and acceptance of their ordinances. In curious and yet complete confirmation of the above statement of the Ritualistic view I give you an extract from the Priest's Prayer-book—an admitted Ritualistic authority. In it there is a 'Form of Reconciliation of a Baptized Dissenter' in which are these prayers. 'O God, who by Thine only begotten Son didst restore man made in Thine image when deceived by the craft of the serpent, mercifully look upon thy servant N——— who desires to come out of the darkness of error into the light of Thy truth.'

'Almighty and merciful God, graciously receive this Thy sheep saved from the jaws of the wolf

and of Thy great mercy number him in Thy flock, that the enemy may not rejoice against him, but that Thy Church may be glad of his conversion and deliverance, and receive as a mother her child which was dead and is alive again, which was lost and is found.'

Absolution pronounced by the priest while he places his hand on the head of the penitent: '. . . I, His priest, by His authority committed unto me, do absolve thee from all ecclesiastical censures, which thou hast or mayest have incurred by reason of thy former errors, heresy, and schism. And I restore thee to the full communion of the Catholic Church. In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.'

We have joined with this a

SUPERSTITIOUS VIEW OF THE SACRAMENT OF THE LORD'S SUPPER.

On the sacramental controversy of course we shall not enter. According to our view the Bible teaches us that we are to regard the sacrament of the Lord's Supper as conveying a pledge to us that God will be faithful to the terms of His covenant in Christ; that the partaking of it is to be regarded

as a profession of faith in the one great atoning sacrifice 'offered once for all;' that to those who partake in the right spirit special blessing will be imparted; that it is a commemorative rite and one to be observed by all Christians in all ages; but that the elements from the beginning to the end remain unchanged 'bread and wine.' The Ritualists teach either consubstantiation or transubstantiation. It is unnecessary to multiply quotations. Let the following prayer from the 'Priest's Prayer-book' suffice:

'Holy Bread! Living Bread! Pure Bread! who camest down from heaven and givest life unto the world, come into my heart, and cleanse me from all defilement of flesh and spirit. Enter into my soul, heal and cleanse me within and without; be the protection and continual health of my soul and body, so that I may by a strait way arrive at Thy kingdom where, not as now in mysteries, but face to face we shall behold Thee; when Thou shalt have delivered up the kingdom to God Thy Father, and shalt be God all in all, then shalt Thou satisfy me with Thyself by a marvellous fulness, so that I shall never hunger, nor thirst any more. Who with the same God the Father and the Holy Ghost livest,' etc.

RITUALISM REPUDIATED BY THE APOSTLES.

Let us imagine a Ritualistic church, with its altar, its crosses, its host, and its priests with their gorgeous vestments. Service is going on. The consecrated elements are elevated. The sacrificing priest bows in lowly adoration. The sermon is delivered, and is mainly an appeal to the people to come to the Confessional, and winds up with the declaration that the preacher and his fellow-priests are the successors of the apostles. Now, if it were possible for some of the apostles to anticipate the Resurrection, and to be present, would not St. John cry out: 'God is a Spirit, and they that worship Him must worship Him in spirit and in truth'? Would not St. Peter, with his wonted bluntness, say, No successors of ours are ye, oh people, turn from these vanities, and serve the living God. Through Jesus of Nazareth, whom the Jews crucified, is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins, and, through Him, all who believe are justified from all things from which they could not be justified by the law of Moses'? And would not St. Paul, with his vehemence, exclaim, 'God sent me not to baptize, not to perform ceremonies, not to

hear confessions, not to bow down to emblems, consecrated by myself;—but to preach the gospel,' and to declare that 'to him that worketh not, but believeth on Him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness'?

I have endeavoured to show you what Ritualism really is, and to account for the hold that it undoubtedly has upon its adherents, and the reasons why it is progressing in our day. I have also endeavoured to show you that it is unmistakably condemned by the Word of God, that it is opposed to human liberty and progress, that it degrades the individual, that it is opposed to all our Protestant traditions and instincts, that it directly tends to bring us under the baleful sway of Rome, and that therefore every lover of his independence, his country, his Bible, and his God, should join with those who, by God's grace, are determined, as far as in them lies, to maintain the Protestant religion and the liberties of this realm.

HAYMAN, CHRISTY & LILLY, LTD., PRINTERS, 113 FARRINGDON RD., E. C.

ST. STEPHEN'S PARK

TEMPERANCE HOTEL

(RUSSELL'S)

DUBLIN.

Charges moderate. Every comfort. Excellent attendance.